

A Florilegium in the Life of Nicetas of Medicon and a Letter of Theodore of Studios

ALEXANDER ALEXAKIS

In this paper I am going to study one of the least favorite works of the Second Iconoclasm, which has been entirely neglected up to now because of its derivative and secondary nature. Since this work is a florilegium, its fate is understandable for obvious reasons: if nothing else, florilegia are usually treated as the poor relatives among the manuscript sources for a given work. Furthermore, an Iconophile florilegium of the ninth century which mainly consists of short fragments from earlier texts (such as the works of Basil or Gregory of Nyssa), which are transmitted by scores of manuscripts, can be rightly denied any further treatment. Yet, a publication of the transcribed text of the Iconophile florilegium of Nicetas of Medicon, along with a study of its sources and its possible connections with other Iconophile florilegia, may lead to interesting suggestions and conclusions.

Chronologically, the Iconophile florilegium of Nicetas of Medicon († 3 April 824) must be one of the latest in a row of collections of Iconophile χρήσεις. The production of Iconophile florilegia started with the partly preserved (in Latin) florilegium of the Roman Synod of 731;¹ continued with the three florilegia of John of Damascus;² and culminated with the enormous compilation of the year 770, which was carried out by the anonymous author of the *Adversus Iconoclastas*,³ probably in Rome. The compiler of the year 770 seems to have collected in a single manuscript all the earlier Iconophile florilegia, including the anthology of Greek quotations on which the Latin florilegium of the Roman Synod of 731 had been based, the florilegia of John of Damascus, and other less important ones. In the year 774/5, this florilegium was copied/incorporated along with other theological works and anthologies in a very extensive dossier that was deposited in the library of St. Peter in Rome.⁴ Codices *Parisinus graecus* 1115 (fols. 235^v–283^v, a. 1276, henceforth P)⁵ and *Venetus Marcianus graecus* 573 (fols. 2–26, tenth century, henceforth

¹See A. Alexakis, "Codex *Parisinus Graecus* 1115 and Its Iconophile Florilegium," Ph.D. thesis (Oxford University, 1991), 29–34. For this synod see W. Hartmann, *Die Synoden der Karolingenzeit im Frankreich und in Italien*, Konziliengeschichte, ed. W. Brandmüller, Reihe A: Darstellungen 6 (Paderborn, 1989), 40–41.

²These florilegia are appended to each one of the three Iconophile sermons of John of Damascus (*CPG* 8045 [see below note 13]), edited by B. Kotter, *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskus*, vol. III, *Contra Imaginum Calumniatores Orationes tres*. Patristische Texte und Studien 17 (Berlin-New York, 1975), 144–200.

³This work appears in PG 96, cols. 1347–1361c, and PG 109, cols. 499–516.

⁴Alexakis, "Codex *Parisinus Graecus* 1115," 94–101.

⁵See J. Munitiz, "Le *Parisinus Graecus* 1115: Description et arrière-plan historique," *Scriptorium* 36 (1982), 51–67.

V)⁶ preserve partly overlapping parts of the 775 apograph, while codex *Mosquensis Hist. Mus.* 265 (fols. 142–241, tenth century, henceforth M),⁷ has copied another apograph of the 770 anthology.⁸ It seems also very likely that the Seventh Ecumenical Council made use of another copy of the 770 florilegium and of the florilegia of John of Damascus.⁹ During the Second Iconoclasm, the Patriarch Nicephorus I must have had access to a copy of the 770 florilegium that belonged to the line of transmission represented by M.¹⁰ I skip, for the time being, Theodore of Studios, who in his letters and works seems to ignore the collection of the year 770, and I come to the florilegium of Nicetas of Medicion. It seems convenient to start my study with the technical information and the transcription of the text, and in the second part of this paper I will treat a number of questions related to this anthology.

Codex *Vaticanus graecus* 511 preserves in folios 66^v–68^v a small collection of Iconophile excerpts,¹¹ which, according to the lemma, was compiled by Nicetas of Medicion.¹² This florilegium consists of twenty-seven fragments which cannot lay any claim to textual perfection and is followed by another group of eleven fragments under the lemma Περί τοῦ μὴ συνοικεῖν τοῖς αἰρετικοῖς (fols. 68^v–69). The compiler gives some lines—those which directly support the Iconophile case, usually less than the original fragment as it appears in PV or M—and does not go to the trouble of quoting the work from which the fragment comes. He simply cites the name of the author and the passage, and in some excerpts he adds his own comments.

I give here all twenty-seven fragments along with an *apparatus criticus*, which includes the variants or sometimes the whole passage as it is transmitted by PV or M. In a second apparatus I give the identification of each passage, for which I have kept the *CPG*¹³ numbers and quoting standards, supplemented by *BHG* when necessary.¹⁴ I also provide the reference of each passage in the PG (or any other edition if not in PG), and in the Mansi edition of the Seventh Ecumenical Council.¹⁵ Needless to say, the spelling and punctuation of the original manuscript has been retained.

Sigla:

N: *Vaticanus graecus* 511

P: *Parisinus graecus* 1115

V: *Venetus Marcianus graecus* 573

M: *Mosquensis Hist. Mus.* 265

⁶See E. Mioni, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum Codices Graeci Manuscripti*, II (Rome, 1981), 476–78.

⁷See Vladimir (Archimandrite), *Sistematicheskoe opisanie rukopisej Moskovskoj sinodal'noj (patriarsei) biblioteki*, I (Moscow, 1894), 226–30.

⁸Alexakis, “Codex *Parisinus Graecus* 1115,” 102–12.

⁹*Ibid.*, 145–251.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, 252–53.

¹¹See R. Devreesse, *Codices Vaticani Graeci*, II, Codd. 330–603 (Rome, 1938), 364–65. The part of the manuscript that contains the florilegium of Nicetas dates from the eleventh century.

¹²See H. G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft XII/2, 1 = Byzantinisches Handbuch II/1)* (Munich, 1959), 496.

¹³*Clavis patrum graecorum*, vols. II–IV, ed. M. Geerard (Turnhout, 1974–80).

¹⁴*Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*, 3rd ed., ed. F. Halkin (SubHag. 8a) (Brussels, 1957).

¹⁵J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, 31 vols. (Florence-Venice, 1759–98), vols. XII and XIII.

CODEX VATICANUS GRAECUS 511

folio 66^v

τοῦ ὁσίου πατρ(ος) ἡμῶν (καὶ) ὁμολογητ(ου) Νικήτ(α) τοῦ Μηδικίου
ἐκλο(γη) πε(ρὶ) τ(ῆ)ς τ(ῶν) ἀγί(ων) εἰκόνων προσκυνήσεως:

1.

- 1 Φωνὴ τοῦ ἀγίου ἀπο(στολου) Πέτρου:
ἐν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τοῦ μαρτυρίου τοῦ ἀγίου Πανκρατί(ου) ἔστιν
οὕτ(ως)· τέκν(ον) ἰωσήφ· ἐξένεγκε τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ κ(υρί)ου
ἡμῶν ἰ(ησο)υ χ(ριστο)υ· καὶ ἐντύπ(ω)σον αὐτὴν ἐν τ(ῶ)
fol. 67 πυργίσκ(ω)· ἵνα ἰδόντες, ἐπὶ πλέ(ον)// πιστεύσ(ω)σιν· ὁρῶντες
6 τ(ὸν) τύπον τῆς μορφ(ῆς) αὐτ(ου), καὶ ὑπόμνησιν λαμβάν(ω)σι
τ(ῶν) παρ' ἡμῖν εἰς αὐτοὺς κηρυχθέντ(ων).

P: fol. 254^v

1 Φωνή—3 οὕτως: ἐκ τοῦ βίου τοῦ ἀγίου ἱερομάρτυρος) παγκρατίου P 5 post ἵνα add. ἴδωσιν οἱ λαοὶ
ποῖαν μορφὴν ἀνέλαβεν ὁ υ(ιὸς) τοῦ θεο(υ)· καὶ P ὁρῶντες—6 αὐτ(ου) P om. post καὶ add. ἐπὶ πλέον
P ὑπόμνησιν λαμβάν(ω)σι: λαμβάνωσι τὴν γνῶσιν P 7 ἡμῖν: ἡμῶν P.

BHG 1410a, b, n,

Ed. H. Usener, *Kleine Schriften*, IV (Berlin-Leipzig, 1913), 418.

2.

- 1 καὶ τοῦ ἀγίου ἀπο(στολου) Παύ(λου) λέγοντ(ος)· ὁ ἀνόητοι
γαλάται· τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκα(ι supra lin.)νε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ
πεῖθεσθαι· οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς ἰ(ησο)υ χ(ριστο)υ προεγράφη
ἐσταυρ(ω)μ(ένος).

P: fol. 281^v; M: fol. 160^{r-v}

1 καὶ—λέγοντ(ος): ἐκ τ(ῆς) πρ(ὸς) γαλάτας ἐπιστολῆς P; πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ πρὸς γαλάτας ἐπιστολῇ
φησὶν M 3 post προεγράφη add. ἐν ὑμῖν PM 4 ἐσταυρ(ω)μ(ένος): σ(τα)υρουμενος P.

Gal. 3:1.

3.

- 1 τ(οῦ) ἀγί(ου) διον(υσί)(ου)· εἰ δὲ τὰς ἀπεμφαινούσας
εἰκονογραφίας αἰτιάσονται τις· ἀνατεθῆναι τὰ οὕτως αἰσχρὰ
μωρώματα τ(αῖς) θεοειδέσι καὶ ἀγιωτάταις διακοσμήσεσιν,
ἀπόχρη πρ(ὸς) αὐτ(ὸν) εἰπ(εῖν)· ὡς διττός ἐστι τῆς ἱερᾶς
5 ἐκφαντορίας ὁ τρόπ(ος)· ὁ μ(έν), ὡς εἰκὸς διὰ τ(ῶν) ὁμοί(ων)
ἱεροτύπ(ων) εἰκόν(ων)· ὁ δ(ε) δι(α) τ(ῶν) ἀνομοί(ων)
μορφοποι(ῶν)· εἰς τὸ παντελὲς ἀπεικ(ος)· καὶ ἀπεμφαίν(ων)
πλαττόμ(ενος).

P: fol. 256; V: fol. 8

1 τοῦ—διον(υσί)(ου): τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς περὶ οὐ(ρα)νιου ἱεραρχίας λόγου P, τοῦ ἀγίου Διονυσίου τοῦ
ἀρεοπαγί(του) μαρτυρίαι εἰς τὰς αὐτὰς ἀγίας καὶ ἱερὰς εἰκόνας V (f.6^v) 2 post τις add. αἰδεῖσθαι
λέγων PV 3 μωρώματα: μορφώματα PV θεοειδέσι: —σιν V 4 ἐστι: —ιν V 5 post ὁμοί(ων) add. προῖων
PV 7 μορφοποι(ῶν): μορφοποιῶν V παντελὲς: —λῶς PV ἀπεικ(ος): ἐπεικῶς P ἀπεμφαίν(ων): —ον V.

CPG 6600, Ps.-Dionysius Areopagita, *De coelesti hierarchia*,
PG 3, col. 140B–C.

4.

- 1 τοῦ ἁγίου ἀθανα(σίου): οὐχ' ὡς Θεοὺς τὰς εἰκόνας προσκυνοῦμεν
οἱ πιστοὶ· μὴ γένοιτο ὥσπερ οἱ Ἕλληνες· ἀλλ(ὰ) μόν(ον) τ(ὴν) σχέσιν καὶ
τ(ὴν) ἀγάπην τὴν πρὸς τ(ὸν) χαρακτήρα τῆς εἰκόνο (sic) ἐμφανίζομεν(εν).

P: fol. 253^v

1 τοῦ—ἀθανα(σίου): τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς ἀντίοχον δοῦκα διαλέξεως καὶ ἐρωτήσεως κε(φάλαιον)
ρλζ' 3 τ(ὴν) om. P post χαρακτήρα add. τοῦ προσώπου P εἰκόνο: –ος P 4 ἐμφανίζομεν(εν): –ίζοντες P.

CPG 2257, Athanasius Alexandr., *Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem*,
PG 28, col. 621A.

5.

- 1 καὶ πάλιν· ὁ γοῦν προσκυν(ῶν) τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ βασιλέως· ἐν
αὐτῇ προσκυνεῖ τ(ὸν) βασιλέα· ἡ γὰρ ἐκεῖν(ου) μορφή· καὶ τὸ
εἶδος, ἐστὶν ἡ εἰκὼν.
sequitur scholium Nicetae: τοίνυν καὶ ὁ προσκυν(ῶν) τὴν
5 εἰκόνα τοῦ χ(ριστ)ου, πάντως ἐν αὐτῇ προσκυνεῖ τ(ὸν)
χ(ριστό)ν· ἡ γὰρ ἐκεῖν(ου) μορφή καὶ τὸ εἶδος, ἐστὶν ἡ εἰκὼν.

P: fol. 253^v; V: fol. 8^v; M: fol. 239^v–240

1 καὶ πάλιν: τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ κ(ατὰ) ἀρειανῶν P, ἀθανασίου τοῦ ἀγιωτατ(ου) ἀρ(χι)επισκ(οπου) ἀλε-
ξανδρείας ἐκ του λογ(ου) του κατα αρειανῶν V, τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀθανασίου ἀρ(χι) ἐπισκ(ο)π(ου) Ἀλεξαν-
δρείας ἐκ τοῦ τετάρτου λόγου κατὰ Ἀριανῶν M ὁ γοῦν—3 εἰκὼν om. V 1 τοῦ βασιλέως om. PM.

CPG 2093, *Orationes contra Arianos iii*,
PG 26, col. 332B.
Mansi XIII, 69C; 273A.

6.

- 1 τοῦ ἁγι(ου) βασι(λειου). εἶδο(ν) φαιδρότερ(ον) ἐπὶ τῆς
ὑμετέρας τ(ὸν) παλαιστ(ὴν) γεγραμ(ένον) εἰκόνο·
κλαυσάτ(ω)σ(αν) δαίμον(ες)· καὶ νῦν ταῖς τοῦ μάρτυρος ἐν ὑμῖν
ἀριστεταῖς πληττόμενοι· ἐγγραφέσθ(ω) τ(ῶ) πίνακι καὶ ὁ τ(ῶν)
5 παλαισμάτ(ων) ἀγωνοθέτης χ(ριστο)ς.
sequitur scholium Nicetae: ὁρᾶτε ὅτι οἱ δαίμονες μόνοι
κλαίουσι καὶ θλίβονται ὁρῶντες τὰ τ(ῶν) ἁγί(ων) ἀνδραγαθήματα
ἐν τ(αῖς) εἰκόσι γραφόμενα· οἱ δὲ ἀ(νθρωπ)οὶ οἰκοδομοῦνται
καὶ δοξάζουσι τὸν θε(ο)ν.

P: fol. 247^v; V: fol. 9^{r-v}

1 τοῦ—βασι(λειου): τοῦ ἁγίου βασιλεί(ου) ἐπισκόπ(ου) καισαρεί(ας) καππαδοκεῖ(ας) μαρτυρία περὶ
τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις οἰκοῖς εἰκόνων P, τ(ου) αὐτ(ου) ἐκ τ(ου) εἰς Βαρλαάμ τον μάρτυρα V εἶδο(ν): ἰδω
PV 2 γεγραμ(ένον): γεγραμμένον PV 3 καὶ νῦν om. V ἐν ὑμῖν om. P ante ἐν ὑμῖν transp. ἀριστεταῖς
V post πληττόμενοι add. φλεγομένη πάλιν αὐτοῖς ἡ χεῖρ καὶ νικῶσα δεικνύσθω P 5 χ(ριστο)ς:
θε(ο)ς V.

CPG 2861 Basilius Caesariensis, *In Barlaam martyrem* (BHG 223),
PG 31, col. 489 A–B,
Mansi XIII, 80C–D.

7.

- fol. 67^v καὶ πάλιν· ὅτι βασιλεὺς λέγεται καὶ ἡ τ(οῦ) // βασιλέως
2 εἰκὼν· διὸ καὶ ἡ τῆς εἰκόνοσ τιμῇ, ἐπὶ τὸ πρ(ω)τότυπον
διαβαίνει·
sequitur scholium Nicetae: πάντως δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀτιμάζ(ων) τ(ῆν)
εἰκόνα ἀτιμάζει τ(ὸν) ἐν αὐτῇ γραφόμεν(ον).

P: fol. 248^{r-v}; V: fol. 3^v

1 καὶ πάλιν: om. P, τ(ου) αὐτ(ου) ἐκ τ(ου) πρὸς ἀμφιλοχίον περὶ αἰγίου πνεύματος κεφαλαίου ιη' V
ὅτι om. V ὅτι βασιλεὺς om. P 2 post εἰκὼν add. καὶ οὐ δύο βασιλεῖς, οὔτε (οὐδὲ V) γὰρ τὸ κράτος
σχίζεται, οὔτε (οὐδὲ V) ἡ δόξα διαμερίζεται, PV ὡς γὰρ ἡ κρατοῦσα ἡμῶν ἀρχὴ καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία μία,
οὕτω καὶ ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν δοξολογία μία καὶ οὐ πολλάί. solus P διὸ καὶ: διότι PV.

CPG 2839, *De spiritu sancto*,

Ed. B. Pruche, *Basile de Césarée Sur le Saint-Esprit*, SC 17bis, (Paris, 1968), 45.15–16, 19–20.

Mansi XIII, 69D–E.

8.

- 1 τ(οῦ) αὐ(του)· ὅθεν καὶ τοὺς χαρ(α)κτῆρας καὶ εἰκόνας τ(ων)
ἀγί(ων) τῇ τοιαύτῃ δόξει τιμ(ῶ) καὶ προσκυν(ῶ)· τοῦτο γὰρ
παρεδόθη ἐκ τ(ῶν) ἀγί(ων) ἀποστόλ(ων)· καὶ οὐ κ(ω)λυτέ(ον)
ἀλλ' ἐν πάσ(αις) τ(αῖς) ἐκκλησίαις ἡμ(ων) τ(ῆν) τοιαύτην
5 ἀναστηλοῦμ(εν) ἱστορί(αν).

P: fol. 247^v; M: fol. 223^{r-v},

τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῆς πρὸς ἰουλιανὸν τὸν βασιλέα καὶ παραβάτην P, Ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ ὁσίου
π(ατ)ρ(ος) ἡμῶν Βασιλείου πρὸς Ἰουλιανὸν τὸν παραβάτην M

. . . ὅθεν καὶ τοὺς χαρακτῆρας τῶν εἰκόνων αὐτῶν τιμῶ καὶ προσκυνῶ· καὶ κατ' ἐξαιρέτον τοῦτο παραδ-
εδομένον ἐκ τε (τε om. P) τῶν ἀγίων ἀποστόλων καὶ οὐκ ἀπηγορευμένον· ἀλλ' ἐν ἀπάσαις (πάσαις P)
ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἡμῶν τούτων ἀνιστορουμένων.

Cf. Mansi XII, 1066C.2–4/D.4–8:

. . . ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τοῦ ἀγίου Βασιλείου τῇ πρὸς Ἰουλιανὸν τὸν παραβάτην ἐμφέρεται· . . . διὸ καὶ
τὰς ἱστορίας τῶν εἰκόνων αὐτῶν τιμῶ καὶ προσκυνῶ φανερώς. τοῦτο γὰρ παρεδόθη ἐκ τῶν ἀγίων ἀπο-
στόλων, καὶ οὐ κωλυτέον· ἀλλ' ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἡμῶν τὴν αὐτῶν ἀναστηλοῦμεν ἱστορίαν.

CPG 2900, *Epistula* 360,

Ed. Y. Courtonne, *Saint Basile, Lettres*, III (Paris, 1966), 220.11–15.

Mansi XII, 1066C–D; XIII, 72E–73A.

9.

- 1 τοῦ ἀγί(ου) γρηγορίου τ(ῆς) μ(ε)γ(αλ)ῆς ἀρμ(εν)ιας (καὶ) ἀντὶ
τ(ων) ξύλ(ων) ἔπηξε τὸν σ(α)υρο(ν) ἐν μέσ(ω) τ(ῆς)
οἰκουμ(έν)ης· ἵνα οἱ ἐθισθέντ(ες) προσκυν(εῖν) τὰ ξύλα δι(α)
τ(ῆς) τοιαύτ(ης) συνηθείας πιστεύσ(ω)σι προσκυν(εῖν) τ(ὸν)
5 σ(α)υρο(ν) καὶ τὴν ἐπάν(ω) ἀνθρ(ω)πόμορφ(ον) εἰκόνα.

M: fol. 238

1 τοῦ—ἀρμ(ενίας): ἐκ τοῦ μαρτυρίου τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου ἀρμενίας M 2 ἔπηξε: ἔπιξεν M 4 τ(ῆς) om.
M 5 post σ(αυρον) add. αὐτοῦ M.

CPG 7547.(2) Agathangelus, *Historia Armeniae, Versio Graeca*, (BHG 712),
Ed. G. Lafontaine, *La version grecque ancienne du livre Arménien d'Agathange* (Publications de l'Institut orientaliste de Louvain 7) (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1973), 202.9–13.

10.

- 1 τοῦ ἁγίου) γρη(γορίου) τοῦ θαυμα(τουργου). οἱ μὴ
προσκυνοῦν(τες) τ(ὸν) τίμι(ον) σ(αυ)ρον τοῦ κ(υρι)ου ημ(ων)
ἱ(η)σου χ(ρι)στ(ου)· καὶ τὴν ἐν εἰκόσι μορφὴν αὐ(τ)ου
κ(ατα)σπαζόμενοι ὡς θ(ε)ου σαρκ(ω)θέντος καὶ οὐχ ὡς
5 ἀν(θρωπ)ου ψιλοῦ· ἀνάθεμα ἔστωσαν καὶ τῆς τ(ῶν) χρι(στ)ιαν(ῶν)
θρησκείας ἀλλότριοι.

P: fol. 251^v; V: fol. 3

1 τοῦ—θαυμα(τουργου): τ(ου) αὐ(του) ὄρος συνοδικός P, τοῦ αγιωτάτου Γρηγορίου τοῦ θαυματουργοῦ
ορος συνοδικ(ος) V 2 τ(ον)—σ(ταυρο)ν: τὸν σταυρὸν τὸν τίμιον PV ημ(ων) om. PV 3 τὴν ἐν εἰκόσι:
τὴν ἁγίαν ἐν εἰκόνι PV 5 καὶ—6 ἀλλότριοι om. PV.

*Locum non inveni.*¹⁶

11.

- 1 του ἁγίου) γρη(γορίου) τοῦ θεολό(γου)· ταύτην ἰδοῦσα· καὶ
γὰρ ἦν σεβασμία ἢ εἰκὼν· ἀπῆλθ(εν) εὐθύς καὶ θέας ἡττημ(ενη)
ὡς ζῶντα· αἰσχυνθεῖσα τ(ὸν) τεθνε(ῶ)τα.

P: fol. 248; V: fol. 3^v–4

1 τοῦ—θεολό(γου): τοῦ ἁγίου γρηγορίου τοῦ θεολόγου ἐκ τῶν ἐπὶ ἀρετῆς λόγου καὶ εἰς πολέ-
μωνα P, Γρηγορίου τ(ου) θεολόγ(ου) ἐκ τ(ου) περι ἀρετῆς κ(αι) εἰς πολέμωνα λόγου· V ταύτην: ταύτ
P 2 ἢ εἰκὼν om. PV 3 τεθνε(ῶ)τα: γεγραμμένον PV.

CPG 3035, Gregorius Nazianzenus, *Carmina moralia*,
PG 37, 738,
Mansi XIII, 13B-C.

12.

- 1 καὶ πάλιν· εἶπερ ἀγγελικὸν λαμπροφορία· καὶ φαιδρότης· ὅταν
τυποῦνται σ(ω)ματικῶς· σύμβολ(ον) οἶμαι τοῦτο τῆς κατὰ
φύ(σιν) αὐ(τ)ῶν καθαρότητος.

¹⁶Compare, however, quotation III 129 from the third Iconophile florilegium of John Damascene: Τῆς
ἀγίας καὶ οἰκουμένης πέμπτης συνόδου ἀναθεματισμὸς ιβ'. Εἴ τις ἀντιποιεῖται Θεοδώρου τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς τοῦ Μο-
ψουεστίας τοῦ εἰπόντος ἄλλον εἶναι τὸν θεὸν λόγον καὶ ἄλλον τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπὸ παθῶν ψυχικῶν καὶ τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς
ἐπιθυμιῶν ἐνοχλούμενον καὶ τῶν χειρόνων κατὰ μικρὸν χωριζόμενον καὶ οὕτως ἐκ προκοπῆς ἔργων βελτιωθέντα
καὶ ἐκ πολιτείας ἀμώμου καταστάντα, ὡς ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον βαπτισθῆναι εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου
πνεύματος λαβόντα καὶ υἱοθεσίας ἀξιοθῆναι καὶ κατὰ ἰσότητά βασιλικῆς εἰκόνας εἰς πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου
προσκυνεῖσθαι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. = Kotter, *Die Schriften*, III, 195–96.

CPG 3010.25, *In laudem Heronis Philosophi*,
PG 35, col. 1200.17–20.

13.

- 1 τ(οῦ) νύσ(ης)· εἶδον πολλάκις ἐπὶ γραφῆς εἰκόνα πάθους καὶ
οὐκ ἀδακρυτὶ τὴν θε(αν) παρῆλθον· ἐναργῶς τῆς τέχν(ης)
ἀγούσ(ης) τὴν ἱστορίαν.

P: fol. 251

1 τοῦ νύσ(ης): τοῦ ἀγίου γρηγορίου ἐπισκόπου νύσης ἐκ τοῦ περὶ θεότητος λόγου καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀβραάμ P
post εἰκόνα add. τοῦ P 2 post τέχν(ης) add. ὑπ' ὅψιν P.

CPG 3192, Gregorius Nyssenus, *De deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti*,
PG 46, 572c,
Mansi XII, 1066b; XIII 9C–D/117A.

14.

- 1 καὶ αὐθις· οἶδε γὰρ καὶ γραφῇ σι(ω)πῶσα ἐν τοίχ(ω) λαλ(εῖν)·
καὶ τὰ μέγιστα ὠφελεῖν.

P: fol. 251^v; V: fol. 4^v; M: fol. 239^v,

1 καὶ αὐθις: τ(ου) αὐτ(ου) ἐκ τῆς αὐτ(ου) ἐρμηνεί(ας) P, φάσκει τε αὐτὸς κ(αι) ἐν ετέρῳ χωρίῳ V, τοῦ
ἀγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Νύσης εἰς τὸν ἅγιον μάρτυρα Βασιλίσκον M ἐν τοίχ(ω) om. PVM λαλ(εῖν)—2
καὶ om. M.

CPG 3183, *De Sancto Theodoro*,
Ed. G. Heil—J. P. Cavarnos—O. Lendle—F. Mann, *Gregorii Nysseni Sermones, Pars II*, X.1 (Leiden-
New York, 1990), 63.12–13.

15.

- 1 του Χρ(υσοστομου)· ἐγὼ καὶ τὴν κηρόχυτ(ον) ἠγάπησα γραφὴν
εὐσεβείας ἔνεκα πεπληρ(ω)μ(ενην)· εἶδον γὰρ ἄγγελ(ον) ἐν
εἰκόνι ἐλαύνοντα βαρβάρ(ων) στήφη.

P: fol. 252; V: fol. 11^{r-v}; M fol. 228^v

1 τοῦ Χρ(υσοστομου): τοῦ αὐτ(ου) [Τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου· M] ἐκ τοῦ λόγου ὅτι παλαιᾶς
καὶ καινῆς διαθήκης εἷς ὁ νομοθέτης· VP [ἔστι add. M] καὶ εἰς τὸ ἔνδυμα τοῦ ἱερέως PM, ἠγάπησα
post γραφὴν transp. VM 2 ἔνεκα om. PVM post πεπληρ(ω)μ(ενην) add. οὐσαν M 3 στήφη: στίφη
V, νέφη M.

CPG 4192, Severianus Gabal., *Homilia de Legislatore*,
PG 56, col. 407. 43–46.
Mansi XIII 9A/300D/324C.

16.

- 1 τ(οῦ) αὐ(του)· ἔνδυμα γὰρ βασιλικ(ὸν) ἐὰν ὑβρίσ(ης), τ(ὸν)
τοῦτο ἐνδύομ(ενον) ὑβρίζεις· οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι ἐὰν εἰκόνα
fol. 68 βασιλικὴν ὑβρίσης εἰς τὸ πρ(ω)τότυπ(ον)// τῆς ἀξίας
ἀναφέρρ(εις) τὴν ὑβριν, οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι ἐὰν εἰς εἰκόνα τίς τὴν

- 5 ἀπὸ ξύλου· οὐχ' ὥς εἰς ἄψυχ(ον) ὕλην τολμήσας κρίνεται· ἀλλ' ὥς κατὰ βασι(λεως)· εἰκὼν δὲ ὅλως φέρουσα τὴν ἐαυτῆς ὕβριν, εἰς τ(ὸν) βασι(λεα) ἀνάγει.
sequitur scholium Nicetae: πάντως καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ χ(ριστ)ου ὕβριζομ(ένη), εἰς τ(ὸν) χ(ριστο)ν ἀναφέρει τὴν ὕβριν.

V: fol. 17^v; M: fols. 228^v (=M1), 235^{r-v} (=M2)

1τ(οῦ) αὐτ(ου): τοῦ αὐτοῦ [τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου M2] εἰς τὴν παραβολὴν τ(ου) σπόρου VM2, τοῦ αὐτ(ου) ἐκ τῆς ἐρμηνείας τῆς παραβολῆς τοῦ σπόρου M1 γὰρ om. VM1M2 τ(ὸν) 2 τοῦτο ἐνδεδυμένον(ενον): οὐ τὸν ἐνδεδυμένον VM1M2 3 βασιλικήν: βασιλέως VM1M2 τὸ: τὸν M1M2 4 ἀναφέρρ(εις): φέρεις V, -ης M1M2 ὅτι—5 οὐχ': ὅτι ἐὰν (τὴν add. M1/ τίς add. M2) εἰκόνα τὴν ἀπὸ ξύλου ἢ ἀπὸ ἀνδριάντος χαλκοῦ (om. M2) κατασύρει (κατασύρης M1) τις (om. M1) οὐχ' 5 κρίνεται:—σαι M1 6 post βασι(λεως) add. κεχωρισμένην V, κεκλημένος M1 εἰκὼν: εἰκόνα VM1M2 ὅλως om. V post ὅλως add. βασιλέως VM1M2, etiam χαρακτῆρα in margine manu recentiori M2 7 ἀνάγει: ἄγη M1, ἐνάγη M2.

CPG 4209, Severianus Gabal., *De sigiliis sermo*,
 PG 63, col. 544.7–15.
 Mansi XII, 1066E-1067A.

17.

- 1 τ(οῦ) αὐτ(ου)· πολλὰς πολλάκις εἶδ(ον) εἰκόνας· καὶ γραφῆας
 ἐθεασάμην, χρ(ώ)μασι τὴν ἀλήθειαν μιμουμ(ένους).

P: fol. 252; V: fol. 11^v; M: fol. 235^v

1τ(οῦ) αὐτ(ου): τοῦ αὐτ(ου) [ἐκ τ(ου) λόγου τ(ου) add. V] εἰς τ(ὴν) τεσσαρακοστὴν καὶ περὶ μετανοίας PV, τοῦ αὐτ(ου) ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς M.

Locum non inveni.

18.

- 1 τ(οῦ) αὐτ(ου)· καὶ γὰρ ἐν δακτυλί(ων) σφενδόσι· καὶ ἐν
 ἐκπώμασι καὶ φιάλαις· καὶ ἐν θαλλάμ(ων) τοί(χοις) καὶ
 πανταχοῦ, τὴν εἰκόνα τὴν ἀγίαν ἐκεῖν(ην) διεχάραξαν πολλοί.

P: fols. 251^v-252; V: fol. 4^{r-v}; M: fols. 228^v-229

1τ(οῦ) αὐτ(ου): τ(ου) ἀγ(ίου) ἰω(αννου) Χρ(υσοστομου) ἐκ τοῦ λόγου εἰς Μελέτιον ἐπίσκοπον ἀντιο-
 χείας καὶ εἰς τὴν σπουδὴν τῶν συνελθόντων· P, του εν αγιοις π(ατρ)ος ἡμῶν ἰωαννου τ(ου) χρυσοστόμου
 ἐκ τ(ου) λόγου τ(ου) πρὸς μελετιον επισκ(ο)π(ον) ἀντιοχείας κ(αι) μαρτυρα εν ᾧ κ(αι) εἰς τὴν σπουδὴν
 τῶν συνελθόντων V, τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῆς πρὸς Μελέτιον ἐπίσκοπον M post γὰρ add. καὶ P
 σφενδόσι: σφενδόνας P, σφενδόνης V, -ῶνες M 2 ἐκπώμασι:—ιν PVM καὶ φιάλαις om. PVM.

CPG 4345, Iohannes Chrysostomus, *De S. Meletio Antiocheno*,
 PG 50, col. 516, 23–26.
 Mansi, XIII 8C-D.

19.

- 1 τοῦ αὐτ(ου)· ἦν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐκτύπ(ω)μα τ(οῦ) ἀγίου παύλου, ἔχων
 ἐν εἰκόνι, ἔνθα ἀνεπαύετο δι(α) τὴν τοῦ σ(ώ)ματος ἀσθένειαν.

P: fol. 252^v

Ι τοῦ αὐτ(ου): ἐκ τοῦ βίου τοῦ ἁγίου ἰω(αννου) τοῦ χρυσοστόμου Ρ ἁγίου: αὐτοῦ ἀποστόλου Ρ ἔχων: -ον Ρ.

CPG 7979, Georgius Alexandrinus, *Vita S. Iohannis Chrysostomi* (BHG 873),

Ed. F. Halkin, *Douze récits byzantins sur Saint Jean Chrysostome*, SubsHag 60, (Brussels, 1977), 142.

20.

- 1 τοῦ ἁγί(ου) Ἐπιφα(νίου)· μὴ γ(ὰρ) ὁ βασιλέως ἔχων εἰκόνα δύο
ἔχει βασιλεῖς; ἀλλ' ὁ βασιλεὺς εἷς ἐστὶ καὶ μετὰ τῆς εἰκόνας.

P: fol. 261^v

τοῦ ἁγίου ἐπιφανίου· Μὴ γὰρ βασιλεὺς ἔχων εἰκόνα δύο βασιλεῖς εἰσὶν, ἀλλ' ὁ βασιλεὺς εἷς ἐστὶ κ(αι) μετὰ τῆς εἰκόνας· τ(ου) αὐτοῦ· καὶ γὰρ καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς διὰ τὸ ἔχειν εἰκόνας οὐ δύο εἰσὶ βασιλεῖς, ἀλλὰ βασιλεὺς εἷς σὺν τῇ εἰκόνι.

Compare also Mansi XII, 1067D2-5

πάλιν τοῦ ἁγίου Ἐπιφανίου Κωνσταντίας τῆς Κύπρου· μὴ γὰρ εἰ βασιλεὺς ἔχει εἰκόνα, δύο εἰσὶ βασιλεῖς; οὐμενουν· ὁ βασιλεὺς εἷς ἐστὶ καὶ μετὰ τῆς εἰκόνας.

CPG 3745, Epiphanius Constantiensis, *Panarion*, (*Adversus Haereses*),

Ed. K. Holl, *Panarion*, GCS 37 (Leipzig, 1933), 12.10.

Mansi XII, 1067D.

21.

- 1 του ἁγί(ου) κυρίλλ(ου) ἀλεξανδ(ρειας)· ἀλλὰ καὶ τ(ῶν)
ἐκκλησι(ῶν) τὰ ἅγια σκευὴ ἐπάρας, εἰς κτῆσιν ἰδίαν ἐποίησε·
καὶ τὰς εἰκόνας δὲ τὰς ἁγίας τὰς ἐν τ(αῖς) αὐ(ταῖς)
ἐκκλησί(αις) ἵσταμ(ενας), κατέβαλε καὶ πυρὶ παρέδωκε.

P: fol. 253; V: fols. 2^v-3; M: fol. 161^{r-v}

Ι τοῦ—ἀλεξανδ(ρειας): τ(οῦ) αὐτ(ου) ἐκ τ(οῦ) [δευτέρου λόγου του add. V] κατὰ [των add. V] αἰρε-
τ(ικῶν) τῶν κατ' αἴγυπτον ἐπισκόπων. PV, om. M τ(ῶν) om. M 2 ἐπάρας: ἐπαρεῖν Ρ, ἐπάραι V κτῆσιν:
χρήσιν PVM ante χρήσιν transpos. ἰδίαν PV ἐποίησε: ἐτόλμησεν PV 3 δὲ om. PV τὰς ἁγίας om.
PVM 4 κατέβαλε:—ἐν VM, κατέστρεψε Ρ.

Locum non inveni.

22.

- 1 τοῦ αὐτ(ου)· εἶδον ἐγ(ὼ) κ(ατὰ) τοίχ(ου) γραφὴν· κόρην
ἐναθλοῦσαν τ(οῖς) σκάμμασι, καὶ οὐκ (in margine dextera usque
ad 4 γὰρ) ἀδακρυτὶ τ(ῇν) θέαν κατώπτευσα. κ(αὶ) αὐθ(ις).
ταῦτα γὰρ μοι προεξένισ(εν) ἡ ἐν τοίχ(ω) γραφὴ δ(ιὰ)
5 χρ(ω)ματουργίας τὴν ἀνδρείαν ὑφηγουμ(ένη) τῆς μάρτυρος.

P: fol. 253; V: fol. 2; M: fol. 239^v

Ι τοῦ αὐτ(ου): τ(ου) αὐτ(οῦ) ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ εἰς μάρτ(υ)ρ(ας) Ρ, ἔφη τοίνυν ὁ τρισμακάριος ἀληθῶς καὶ διαβόητος εἰς εὐσέβειαν κύριλλος, ὁ γεροντὶς κατὰ καιροὺς τῆς ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοπος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ εἰς μάρτυρας V, Κυρίλλου ἀρ(χι)ἐπισκ(ο)π(ου) Ἀλεξανδρείας εἰς τὴν οσίαν μαρτυρά Μ

ἐγὼ om. P τοίχ(ου):—ον PV γραφήν:—ῆς PV 2 post σκάμμασι transpos. κόρην PVM 3 κ(αὶ) αὐθ(ις): om. PV, καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα M 4 γάρ: δέ PV μοι om. M προεξένισ(εν): προὔξენησεν P, προξ— V ἐν— γραφή: ἐν τοιχογραφῇ P, ἐντυχωγραφῇ M.

Locum non inveni.

23.

- 1 λεοντι(ου)· εἰ οὖν τ(οῦ) σ(ταυ)ρου τ(ὸν) τύπ(ον)
προσκυν(οῦ)μ(εν) εἰκόνα τοῦ σ(ταυ)ρου ποιοῦντες ἐξ οἴασοῦν
ὑλῆς, τοῦ σ(ταυρω)θέντος τὴν εἰκόνα πῶς μὴ προσκυνήσ(ω)μ(εν).

Locum non inveni

24.

- 1 τοῦ ἁγ(ι)ου ἀναστασι(ου)· ὥσπερ ὁ παροιν(ῶν) εἰς εἰκόνα
βασι(λεως) τιμ(ω)ρίαν δικαίως ὑφίσταται, ὡς αὐτόκλημα βασιλέα
ἀτιμάσας, καὶ τοι τῆς εἰκόν(ος) οὐδὲν ἕτερον οὔσ(ης), ἢ
ξύλ(ον) καὶ χρ(ώ)μα(τα), τ(ὸν) αὐτ(ὸν) τρόπον καὶ ὁ τ(ὸν)
5 τύπ(ον) τοῦ τινὸς ἀτιμάζ(ων) εἰς αὐτ(ὸν) ἐκεῖν(ον) οὐ
ὁ τύπος (ἐστὶν) ἀναφέρει τὴν ὕβριν.

P: fol. 261; V: fol. 4^v–5

1 τοῦ—ἀναστασι(ου): τ(ου) αὐτ(ου) ἐκ τ(ῆς) πρ(ὸς) Συμεῶνα ἐπί(σκοπον) βοστρῶν περιέχουσα περὶ σαββάτου P, Ἀναστασίου τ(ου) αἰγιατοῦ(ου) επισκόπου θεουπόλεως επιστολὴ πρὸς συμεων επισκ(ο)-πο(ν) Βωστρη περιέχουσα περὶ σαββάτου· V, post ὥσπερ add. γὰρ PV εἰς εἰκόνα: ἐν εἰκόνι PV 2 δικαίως:—αν PV ὑφίσταται: ἐπίσταται PV 3 post τοι add. γε PV 4 post χρ(ώ)μα(τα) add. κηρῶ μεμιγμένα καὶ ἀνακεκραμμένα PV 6 (ἐστίν) om. PV.

CPG 6954, Anastasius I Antiochenus, *Ad Symeonem Bostrensem (fragmenta)*,

PG 89, col. 1408A

Mansi, XIII 56E–57A.

25.

- fol. 68^v Στεφά(νου) Βόστρων·// πᾶσα εἰκ(ὼν), ἐπ' ὀνόματι κ(υριο)υ, ἢ
2 αγγέλου, ἢ προφήτου, ἢ ἀπο(στολου), ἢ μάρτ(υρος), ἢ δικαίου
ἁγία ἐστὶν οὐ γὰρ τὸ ξύλ(ον) προσκυνεῖται, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τ(ῷ)
ξύλῳ μνημονευόμενος καὶ θε(ω)ρ(οῦ)μ(ενος) καὶ τιμ(ῶ)μ(ενος)
5 καὶ προσκυν(οῦ)μ(ενος). καὶ αὐθις· μνήμης οὖν ἕνεκα ἐν τ(αῖς)
εἰκόσι γρ(ά)φοντ(αι), καὶ τιμῶνται, καὶ προσκυνοῦνται οἱ
ἅγιοι ὡς δοῦλοι τοῦ θε(ο)υ.

P: fol. 263^v–264; V: fol. 12^v–14,

CPG 7790, Stephanus Bostrensis, *Contra Iudaeos fragmenta*.

For the fragment see A. Alexakis, “Stephen of Bostra: Fragmenta contra Iudaeos (CPG 7790),” *JÖB* 43 (1993), 48, note 16, text in pages 52 lines 11–13 and 55 lines 45–46.

Mansi XII, 1067D–1070D.

26.

- 1 τοῦ ἁγ(ι)ου Συμ(εωνος) an –εων(?) τοῦ ἐν τῷ θαυμ(αστῷ) ὄρει· εἰ

εἰκόνας βασιλ(εως) ἐνυβριζομ(ενης) θανάτ(ω) ἐξαισι(ω)· και
 πανωλεθρίω π(αρα)δίδονται οἱ τοῦτο ἐπιχειρ(ειν) τολμῶντ(ες),
 πόσ(ης) ἄρα ἄξιοι εἰσιν κ(α)ταδίκ(ης), οἱ εἰς τ(ὴν) εἰκόνα
 τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεο(υ) καὶ τῆς παναχ(ραν)τ(ου) θεοτο(κου) μετὰ
 πάσ(ης) ἀναιδείας τοῦτο ποιοῦντες.

P: fol. 264^{r-v}; V: fol. 12,

1 τοῦ—ὅρει: τ(ου) ἀγ(ίου) συμεῶνος τοῦ εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν ὅρος ἐκ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τ(ῆς) πεμφθεί(σης)
 πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἰουστι(νι)ανόν P, Συμεων τ(ου) στηλίτου τ(ου) ἐν τῷ θαυμαστῷ ὅρει ἐκ τ(ῆς) ἐπι-
 στολῆς τῆς πεμφθείσης πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ἰουστίνον V εἰ om. PV 3 π(αρα)δίδονται: παραδίδοσθαι PV
 οἱ—τολμῶντ(ες): τοὺς τοῦτο ἐπιχειρεῖν τολμῶντας PV 4 post κ(α)ταδίκ(ης) add. εἰς ἀπώλειαν PV 5
 παναχ(ραν)τ(ου): παναγίας PV 6 post ἀναιδείας add. καὶ ἀσεβείας καὶ διὰ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον κακὸν οὐκ
 ἔχω τί εἰπεῖν PV τοῦτο ποιοῦντες: τοιαῦτα τετοληγκότες PV.

CPG 7366, Symeon Stylita Junior, *Epistula ad Iustinum iuniorum*,
 PG 86.2, 3217A
 Mansi XIII, 161A-B.

27.

1 τῆς ἀγίας καὶ συνόδ(ου)· ἔν τισι τ(ῶν) σεπτ(ῶν) εἰκόν(ων)
 γρ(α)φαῖς ἀμνὸς δακτύλ(ω) τοῦ προδ(ρομου) δεικνύμ(ενος)
 ἐγγαράττεται.

P: fol. 263^v; V: fol. 15^v; M: fol. 239,

1 τῆς—συνόδ(ου)· ἐκ τῶν κανόνων τῶν συνελθόντων π(ατερ)ων ἐν τῇ ἑκτη συνόδῳ· κανὼν πγ' P, [ἐκ
 add. M] τῆς ἀγίας κ(αι) [om. M] οἰκουμένης ἑκτης συνόδου VM, post ἀμνὸς add. τῷ PM.

CPG 9444, *Concilium Trullanum anno 692, quinisextum dictum, canon 82* (= Mansi XI, 977E)
 Mansi XII 1079A/1123E; XIII 40E/220C.

accedit scholium Nicetae:

τὸ σεπτ(ὸν) δὲ πάντως, καὶ προσκυνητ(όν)· οὗτοι πάντες οἱ
 ἄγιοι καὶ θεοφόροι π(ατε)ρες ἡμ(ων), οἱ τ(ων) ἀπ(ο)στολ(ων)
 διάδοχοι καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διδάσκαλοι, ἀγίας καὶ σεπτὰς καὶ
 ἱερὰς καὶ σεβασμί(ας) τὰς εἰκόνας τ(ων) ἀγί(ων) ὠνόμασ(αν)·
 5 οἱ δὲ νῦν ψευδολόγοι καὶ τ(ῆς) ἀληθείας ἐχθροὶ· οἱ μιαιοὶ καὶ
 ἀκάθαρτοι, μιαρὰς καὶ ἀκαθάρτους, καὶ εἰδῶλα αὐτὰς
 ἀπεκάλεσαν· ἐναντία τ(ῶν) ἀγί(ων) π(ατερ)ων ἡμ(ῶν)
 διδάσκοντες.

etiam additamentum Nicetae: N: fol. 69^v:

Ταῦτα μ(εν) πν(ευμα)τικοὶ ἡμ(ων) ἀδ(ελφοί) ἐκ πολλ(ων) ὀλίγα
 συλλέξαντες, ἐκ περικοπῆς, ἐγράψαμ(εν) ὑμῖν ἐν συντόμ(ω)·
 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν δυνατ(όν), οὔτε πάντας τοὺς θείους π(ατε)ρας
 μνημονεῦσ(αι), οὔτ(ε) (sic) τὰς βίβλους αὐτ(ῶν) καὶ τὰς
 5 μαρτυρίας καὶ τὰς χρήσ(εις) πλατυτέρως γρ(ά)ψαι· ἀλλ' ὅσ(ον)
 μόν(ον) τ(ὸν) ν(οῦν) ὑμ(ῶν) διεγείρει εἰς τὴν τοῦ κ(υριο)υ
 ἀγάπ(ην)· καὶ ἔχητε ἀπολογίαν πρὸς τοὺς ἐπερωτῶντας ὑμᾶς,
 πε(ρι) τῆς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐλπίδος.

The present transcription of the florilegium has made clear, I hope, its rather medium to bad quality. The omissions and misreadings of the archetype are numerous, and it seems that their source was the original florilegium of Nicetas, since N is a manuscript written by a rather good and competent scribe. This situation speaks in itself about the difficult circumstances under which the compilation was presumably carried out.

In the *additamentum* of folio 69^v the compiler tells us that he copied his florilegium from another one or perhaps from more than one collection. In doing so, (a) he omitted whole works or passages included in his original (ἐκ περικοπῆς ἐγράψαμεν . . . οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν δυνατόν πάντας τοὺς θείους πατέρας μνημονεῦσαι . . .), and (b) he gave in abridged form the quotations he finally copied (ἐγράψαμεν ὑμῖν ἐν συντόμῳ . . . οὔτε (ἦν δυνατόν) τὰς βίβλους αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς μαρτυρίας καὶ τὰς χρήσεις πλατυτέρως γράψαι). Note also the strange use of the word βίβλος: it is the object of the verb γράψαι (πλατυτέρως) along with the μαρτυρίας and χρήσεις.

Furthermore, a recapitulation of the above data may lead to some useful conclusions. The numbers in parentheses refer to the above list.

There are only two quotations (12 and 23) that N does not share with any other source (mss. and the Mansi edition). I would suggest that the extract 23 is a substantially altered fragment of the *Contra Iudaeos Orationes v (fragmenta)* of Leontius of Neapolis (P: fols. 266^v–269^v; M: 171^v–177). I have not been able, however, to find any direct correspondences between 23 and the *Contra Iudaeos* of Leontius, except for two vaguely similar instances.

Only one quotation in N provides a somewhat more extended text than any other source: it is quotation 10, whose *desinit* is as follows: ἀνάθεμα ἔστωσαν καὶ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν θρησκείας ἀλλότριοι. Both V and P stop at ἀνάθεμα ἔστωσαν. However, the rest of the sentence is a standard expression at the end of Conciliar anathemas; here an addition by the compiler himself seems likely.

Many of the quotations had also appeared in the *acta* of the Seventh Ecumenical Council. (nos. 5–8, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 24–27). Three of them are featured only in the small florilegium that was included in the *epistula Synodica*¹⁷ of the year 785 addressed by Pope Hadrian I to the emperors Constantine VI and Irene (nos. 16, 20, 25). The Greek translation of the original Latin *Synodica* was read during the second session of the Seventh Ecumenical Council. For quotation 16, N provides a corrupt version of the Greek text on which the Latin translation in the *Synodica* was based.¹⁸ The case of quotation 25 is more complicated and I need not discuss it here.¹⁹ Quotation 20 is the most interesting for our study. Compare the texts:

(A) P fol. 261^v τοῦ αὐτοῦ (= Ἐπιφανίου)· καὶ γὰρ καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς διὰ τὸ ἔχειν εἰκόνας, οὐ δύο εἰσιν βασιλεῖς, ἀλλὰ βασιλεὺς εἷς σὺν τῇ εἰκόνι.

(B) The original text of the Latin translation in the *Synodica* of Hadrian I as preserved in the *Libellus Synodalis* of the Paris Synod of 825 (MGH, *Concilia* 2, 2),²⁰ 534.34: Item sancti Epiphaniī episcopi Constantiae Cypri: Etenim impera-

¹⁷Mansi XII, 1055A–1071B. The florilegium in 1066A–1070E.

¹⁸Mansi XII, 1068B–C.

¹⁹See my article “Stephen of Bostra: *Fragmenta contra Iudaeos* (CPG 7790), a New Edition,” *JÖB* 43 (1993), 45–60.

²⁰Ed. A. Werminghoff, *Aevi Karolini* 1,2 (Hanover-Leipzig, 1908), 473–551.

tores pro eo quod habent imagines, non duo sunt imperatores, sed imperator unus cum imagine.

(B1) Mansi XII 1069A: Item sancti Epiphanii Constantiae Cypri: Numquid enim et imperator pro eo quod habet imaginem, duo sunt imperatores? non sane; sed imperator unus est etiam cum imagine.

(C) P. fol. 261^v: Τοῦ ἁγίου Ἐπιφανίου· μὴ γὰρ βασιλεὺς ἔχων εἰκόνα δύο βασιλεῖς εἰσιν, ἀλλ' ὁ βασιλεὺς εἷς ἐστὶ καὶ μετὰ τῆς εἰκόνης.

(D) N. fol. 68: Τοῦ ἁγίου Ἐπιφανίου· μὴ γὰρ ὁ βασιλέως ἔχων εἰκόνα, δύο ἔχει βασιλεῖς; ἀλλ' ὁ βασιλεὺς εἷς ἐστὶ καὶ μετὰ τῆς εἰκόνης.

As can be seen, P provides not only the Greek original (A) of the Latin translation (B and B1)²¹ of this fragment, but also the Greek retranslation of the same passage (C). It is striking that N displays a version (D) that is much closer to the Greek retranslation (C) than to the Greek original (A). The same also happens with quotation 8 (Basil, *Epistula* 360, above p. 183). Therefore, P and N are the two basic sources that transmit the Greek retranslation from Latin of an original Greek fragment in three instances.²²

Next I may examine some other significant extracts that N on the one hand, and P, V, and M on the other have in common. Gouillard first mentioned quotation 10, placing it among the rare Iconophile passages.²³ This is not the only one. Quotations 17, 21, and 22 belong to the same category. Despite its attribution to John Chrysostom, I have not been able to locate quotation 17 in any of Chrysostom's works, even with the help of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Yet it appears in P, V, and M. The same holds true for quotations 21 and 22. It is also interesting that quotation 21 is incorporated in the early Iconophile treatise known as *Νουθεσία γέροντος περὶ τῶν ἁγίων εἰκόνων*.²⁴

The above examples may lead us to the safe conclusion that the Iconophile florilegium of *Vaticanus graecus* 511 was a limited compilation that was based on the original of the Iconophile florilegia of P, V, and M. With this in mind, I proceed with the second part of the paper.

II

Among the fragments that had been included in the Iconophile florilegium of 770, and are preserved by P alone, one can find the text of an extract from the *Quaestiones Miscellaneae* (Σύμμικτα ζητήματα) of Hypatius of Ephesus.²⁵ A smaller part of the same fragment can also be found in letter 499 of the recent edition of the correspondence of

²¹Note that B₁ is the text of the translation of Anastasius Bibliothecarius made much later in 873.

²²Apart from the fragments of Epiphanius and St. Basil, the fragment of Stephen of Bostra belongs to the same category. One could object that the Acts of the Seventh Ecumenical Council also contain the same passages, but this does not solve the problem of the provenance of other fragments in N that do not appear in the Acts of 787 such as, for example, quotations 3, 21, 22, etc., in the above list.

²³J. Gouillard, "Hypatios d'Éphèse ou du Pseudo-Denys à Théodore Studite," *REB* 19 (1961), 64.

²⁴Edited from M (fols. 142–171^v) by B. M. Melioranskij, *Georgij Kiprianin i Ioann Ierusalimlianin, dva maloizvestnykh bortsy za pravoslavie v VIII vokie* (St. Petersburg, 1901), xxviii.

²⁵Edited from the codex *Parisinus graecus* 1115 by F. Diekamp, in his "Analecta Patristica," *OCA* 117 (Rome, 1938), 127–29 (CPG 6806).

Theodore the Studite by G. Fatouros.²⁶ Letter 499 is addressed to a certain Nicetas *monazon*, who appears only once in the corpus edited by Fatouros.²⁷ The *monazon* is unknown from any other source.²⁸ Fatouros, following Dobroklonskij, dates the letter to the period 821 to 826.²⁹ In this epistle, Theodore “evaluates” the dogmatic correctness of this supposedly Iconophile fragment of Hypatius that was included in a βιβλίον sent to him by Nicetas. The name of Hypatius is not mentioned, and it was Gouillard who identified that purportedly Iconophile fragment in the letter of Theodore in 1961.³⁰

The problem I am going to address in the remaining part of this paper is the following: we have seen that the Iconophile florilegium of Nicetas of Medicion was entirely based on the archetype of PV and M (or rather on a copy of it). This archetype was one of the two sources for the fragment of Hypatius of Ephesus. The second source of the same fragment was that Nicetas *monazon* who sent it to Theodore of Studios, whereupon Theodore included a small part of it in his letter 499. On account of these facts can we identify Nicetas *monazon* with Nicetas of Medicion? Gouillard, on the basis of the same facts, had already pointed in this direction, but hastened to dismiss the possibility. He drew attention to the fact that the short Iconophile florilegium of Nicetas “offre à peu près les mêmes éléments que le florilège parisien (*viz.* P) et partage avec lui un texte de ‘Grégoire le Thaumaturge,’ très rare dans la littérature iconodule.” However, he rejected that possibility by adding: “Mais que vaut cette attribution?”³¹ Was his reservation justified?

If we assume that Nicetas *monazon* and Nicetas of Medicion are the same person, we have to face some problems which might diminish our certainty on the issue. However, I am going to put forward a series of arguments in favor of a positive answer, in the hope that the identification of Nicetas *monazon* with Nicetas of Medicion will remain a serious possibility.

Nicetas of Medicion is the recipient of five letters from Theodore the Studite.³² In all five letters Theodore addresses Nicetas as abbot (Νικήτα ἡγουμένω). On one occasion, Theodore becomes more explicit writing to “Nicetas, abbot of Medicion” (letter 319: Νικήτα ἡγουμένω τοῦ Μηδικίου). How is it possible that the sixth letter is addressed to a *monazon*?

²⁶*Theodori Studitae Epistulae*, ed. G. Fatouros, CFHB 31/1,2 (Berlin, 1991). References will be made to this edition.

²⁷Letter 499: *ibid.*, II, 737–738. For a summary of the contents and some scholia see *ibid.*, I, 452*–453*. The old edition of Sirmond—de la Baune is rather defectively reprinted in PG 99, col. 1537A–D; see Fatouros, *ibid.*, I, 120*–121* for details.

²⁸*Ibid.*, I, 453*, n. 886.

²⁹*Ibid.*, I, 453*; A. Dobroklonskij, *Prepodobnyj Feodor, ispovednik i igumen studijskij*, I/II (Odessa, 1913–14), II, 479–80.

³⁰Gouillard, “Hypatios,” 64. For bibliography on the theological problems, the nature of the text, and the different readings provided by the two sources of the fragment itself (cod. *Parisinus gr.* 1115 and *Epistula* 499 of Theodore the Studite), see Fatouros, I, 453*, n. 885. See also the significant article by S. Gero, “Hypatius of Ephesus on the Cult of Images,” in *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults, Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, ed. J. Neusner, part II (Leiden, 1975), 208–16.

³¹Gouillard, “Hypatios,” 68.

³²Letters 255, 280, 319, 422, 425 of the CFHB edition. See Fatouros, II, 385–86, 420, 462–63, 591, 639–41, respectively.

We may get some help from the *vita* of Nicetas of Medicion,³³ written between 829 and 845³⁴ by Theosterictos, a disciple of his (hereafter *VNM*), combined with the letters of Theodore to Nicetas. First, however, the establishment of some chronological points is necessary.

According to the editor, the five letters of Theodore the Studite to Nicetas of Medicion were written on the following dates:

- (a) letter 255: second half of the year 816,
- (b) letter 280: end of 816–beginning of 817,
- (c) letter 319: in the year 818,
- (d) letter 422: beginning of 821,
- (e) letter 452: between the beginning of 821 and the death of Nicetas of Medicion in April 824.

As for the letter to Nicetas *monazon* (499), it is dated from the period between 821 and 826.

Let us consider now what stages in the life of Nicetas these dates mark. According to his *vita*, Nicetas' election as abbot of Medicion was confirmed by the patriarch Nicephorus shortly before the second outbreak of Iconoclasm (§ 24). Since Nicephorus of Medicion—Nicetas' predecessor and founder of the monastery—had died, in all probability in May 813,³⁵ the election of Nicetas must have taken place after that date. In fact, the *VNM* places the installation of Nicetas as abbot before April of 814.³⁶ On Christmas and on the day after Christmas of 814, the emperor Leo V summoned the patriarch, his bishops, and the Iconophile abbots of the preeminent monasteries and made a first attempt to persuade them to adopt Iconoclasm. The Iconophiles strongly resisted the emperor (§§ 33–35), and the whole event ended with Theodore of Studios' exile, the confinement of the abbots in their monasteries, the exile of other bishops to the eastern parts or the western islands of the empire, and the forced resignation of the patriarch Nicephorus (§ 36).

After the Iconoclastic Synod of 815 (the week following Easter) the emperor and the patriarch Theodotus tried to win over the Iconophiles. The abbots of the major monasteries were recalled to Constantinople, but further efforts to convince them failed and

³³*Vita Nicetae Medicensis*, by Theosterictus (*BHG* 1341), *ActaSS* Aprilis, 3rd ed., xviii–xxvii. For the sake of convenience, references to the *vita* will be made by paragraph numbers. A second *vita* of Nicetas by John Hagioelites (*BHG* 1342, K. Doukakes, *Megas Synaxaristes*, vol. 4 [Athens, 1892], 36–51), does not offer anything more than the *ActaSS* version. Note also that the *vita* has been edited from codex *Vaticanus graecus* 1660, folios 366–408 (see Fr. de Cavalieri, *Catalogus Codicum Hagiographicorum Graecorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae*, SubsHag 7 [Brussels, 1899], 155), and not from *Vat. gr.* 1140, as is indicated in the *ActaSS*.

³⁴See I. Ševčenko, "Hagiography of the Iconoclast Period," in *Iconoclasm*, ed. A. Bryer and J. Herrin (Birmingham, 1977), 118, n. 42 (= *Ideology, Letters and Culture in the Byzantine World* [London, 1982], pt. V).

³⁵See *Vita Nicephori Medicensis* (*BHG*, *Novum Auctarium* 2297), ed. F. Halkin, "La Vie de saint Nicéphore fondateur de Médikion en Bithynie († 813)," in *Anal Boll* 78 (1960), 400, 424.

³⁶*VNM* (§ 24–25): (Nicetas was ordained) δι' ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις Νικηφόρου, τοῦ τότε τὸν Πατριαρχικὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατέχοντος θρόνον. (§ 25) Ἐτι δὲ ὄντων ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον, ἤρξαντο ψιθυρίζεσθαι τὰ ἀσεβῆ καὶ θεοστυγῆ κατὰ τῶν σεβασμίων εἰκόνων διηγήματα. The last incident, which has to do with the appointment of the committee of Iconoclast personalities such as John the Grammarian, John Spectas, and others, is placed after the death of Krum in 14 April 814. See P. Alexander, *Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople* (Oxford, 1958), 126 and again *VNM* § 31.

many were imprisoned, Nicetas being one of them (§ 38). In mid-winter of 816, Nicetas was exiled to Masalaion in the East, but after five days in exile he was ordered back to Constantinople and the emperor allowed him to live in loose confinement (§ 39).

When Easter of 816 was over, Nicetas was taken back to prison in adverse conditions and then the Iconoclasts tried a new means to attract the orthodox: they asked the Iconophiles to simply hold communion with the patriarch Theodotus. Nicetas was finally persuaded by other abbots who claimed that such an action was a kind of dispensation (οἰκονομία), not a betrayal of image worship, and took communion from the hands of Theodotus. Then he was given permission to return to his monastery, but he left Constantinople with the intention of fleeing to another place and sailed to Prokonnesos (§§ 42–43).

Theodore of Studios refers to that event in one of his letters to his brother Joseph (222),³⁷ naming Nicetas only by the surname Μηδικιώτης.³⁸ If we are to believe another letter of Theodore, Nicetas actually returned to his monastery, where he repented and then left.³⁹ So, after Prokonnesos (according to *VNM*) or after his return to Medicion (according to Theodore the Studite) Nicetas went back to Constantinople and stood fast by his Iconophile belief in front of the emperor. As a result he was banished to the island of Glykeria in the Sea of Marmora (Summer or Fall of 816). There, a certain eunuch Anthimos, *exarchos* of the monasteries on the Marmora islands, did his best to make Nicetas' life difficult during the six years (816–821) he lived there, until the death of Leo V (§§ 43 and 46).

Theodore of Studios was very appreciative of the repentance of Nicetas and of his defense of image veneration, and in the first two letters (255 and 280) he praised him on that account. In letter 280 Nicetas is called a confessor (p. 420.13). The next letter of Theodore was sent to Nicetas while the latter was still on Glykeria (March–April 818). It is clear that by that time the two men corresponded regularly.⁴⁰ Theodore informs Nicetas about the death of Theophanes Confessor (12 March 818). At the same time (Spring of 818) Nicetas is mentioned in another letter of Theodore to his brother Joseph (333),⁴¹ in connection with his defense of image worship.

The fourth letter addressed to Nicetas (422) was written soon after the assassination of Leo V (Christmas of 820) and it is likely that Nicetas was still in exile, since Theodore informs him of the death of Leo V. The emperor Michael II had already made clear that not many things were going to change and, in any case, restoration of the icons was not to be expected. Hence the tone of disappointment in Theodore's letter: ὅμως καὶ οὕτω ἀστραψάσης τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστιν ἄθρησις, οὐδαμοῦ ἀνάνηψις (591.10–11), and σὺ δέ, ὦ ἱερὰ κεφαλὴ, (sc. Nicetas) . . . μὴ ἀπολήξειας προσευχομένη καταλλαγὴν φθάσαι ἄνωθεν τῷ λαῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . (591.16).

³⁷ Fatouros, 349.8.

³⁸ Μηδικιώτης is also referred to in letters 136, 177, 197, 267, 333, 432 of Theodore Studite. All except 432 date before 818.

³⁹ Letter 197 written at the end of 816–beginning of 817, Fatouros, II, 120.20–22: ἵνα δὲ γινώσκῃς, ὅτι καὶ ὁ Φλουβουτῆς ὡσπερ ὁ Μηδικιώτης ἀνέσφηλεν· καὶ ὁ μὲν κρατεῖται, ὁ δὲ ἀπανεχώρησε τῆς μονῆς κλαίων τὴν ἥτταν . . . See also letter 267 to Ignatius, bishop of Miletus (395.25–28): . . . πλὴν ὅτι ὁ Μηδικιώτης ἐπιγνοὺς τὴν ἥτταν, καὶ ὡμολόγηκεν ὀλισθηκέναι καὶ μεταμεμέλῃται σφόδρα, ὡς μεμάθηκα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο φυγὰς ὄχετο, μέγιστον δαῖγμα μετανοίας καὶ ὠφελείας ἐγκαταλείψας τοῖς τε οἰκείοις φοιτηταῖς καὶ τοῖς εὖ φρονούσιν.

⁴⁰ Fatouros, II, 462.2–3: Φιλῶ τοῦ δέχεσθαι ἀντίγραφα παρὰ τῆς τιμιότητός σου ὧν ἐπιστέλλω, . . .

⁴¹ Ibid., 475.34.

The next stage in the life of Nicetas was his recall from exile early in 821, after the accession of Michael II to the throne. He did not, however, return to his monastery, but spent an unspecified period of time going from island to island in the Marmora sea in search of a solitary life and he settled on one of them, where people visited him. Finally he bought a small *metochion* on the Asian coast of the Bosphorus to the northeast of Constantinople and within a short period of time he died on the third of April of 824 (§ 47). His corpse was transferred to the monastery of Medicion and was buried there.

The fifth letter of Theodore of Studios (452) dates from that period,⁴² but it is likely to have been written soon after Theodore's return from exile early in 821. In any case it certainly postdates letter 422. In all these letters Theodore addresses Nicetas in very warm terms,⁴³ and there is no doubt that Theodore valued very much the Iconophile credentials of Nicetas.

Coming to the letter to Nicetas *monazon* (499), the first thing that strikes one is its formality and stiffness. Nicetas is addressed twice in the plural (τῆς ὁσιότητος ὑμῶν 737.2, and ὑπομιμνήσκομεν δὲ καὶ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἐμμέλειαν 738.33–34) and in a somewhat detached manner. Furthermore, Theodore admonishes Nicetas to stick to the Iconophile doctrine, which is not in accordance with the teachings of Hypatius of Ephesus on the subject.⁴⁴ This admonition would be rather unlikely if Theodore were writing to someone of Nicetas of Medicion's persuasion.⁴⁵

At this point, I repeat that it is fairly certain that a copy of the original of PV and M was the basis for the Iconophile florilegium of codex *Vaticanus graecus* 511 attributed to Nicetas of Medicion in the manuscript. On this assumption I may further suggest that during the process of selecting the extracts for his own collection, the compiler came across the fragment of Hypatius, but he could not decide whether it was Iconophile or

⁴²See Fatouros, I, 420*.

⁴³Letter 255: τὴν ὁσιότητά σου . . . ὁ πατήρ ἐν τοῖς πατράσι . . . τῆς πατρικῆς σου ἀγιωσύνης (ibid., II, 385.3/4/12) καὶ οἱ ἄρτι ὁμολογηταί . . . τὴν ἀγιωσύνην σου (386.22/24).

Letter 280: τῇ ἀγιωσύνῃ σου . . . τί γὰρ φίλου συμφορᾶς ἀνιάρωτερον; . . . ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησία ἐγκαταριθμήσασά σε τῷ καταλόγῳ τῶν ἐαυτῆς ὁμολογητῶν . . . πάτερ μου (420.2/5/12–13/27).

Letter 319: τῆς τιμιότητός σου . . . τὴν ὁσιότητά σου (462.2/4).

Letter 422: ἡ ἀγιωσύνη σου . . . σὺ δέ, ὦ ἱερὰ κεφαλὴ καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς οὐθενότητος φίλη . . . μετὰ τῆς ἀγιωσύνης σου (591.2/16/19–20).

Letter 452: τῇ πατρικῇ σου ἀγιωσύνῃ . . . ὦ πάτερ τιμιώτατε (639.2–3/13–14) . . . πάτερ ἅγιε (641.78).

⁴⁴The views of Hypatius of Ephesus on image veneration have been made much clearer by Gero in his article "Hypatius of Ephesus." (see above, note 30). With the help of the correct reading provided by letter 499 of Theodore the Studite (but not by P, which, obviously, gives a falsified text), the fragment of Hypatius reads as follows: " . . . τοὺς ἱεροὺς τῶν ἁγίων ἀγῶνας ἐν γράμμασι μὲν ἡμεῖς ἱεροῖς ἀνευφημεῖσθαι διατυπούμεν, οὐδεμιᾷ πλάσει τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἢ γραφῇ καθάπαξ ἡδόμενοι· συγχωροῦμεν δὲ τοῖς ἀπλουστέροις, ἀτελεστέροις αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν, ὑπὸ συμφυοῦς αὐτῶν ἐναγωγῆς καὶ ὧσει τῇ αὐτοῖς συμμέτρῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐν εἰσαγωγῇ τρόπῳ μαρθάνειν." (Fatouros, II, 737.6–10). As Gero explains ("Hypatius of Ephesus," 210) "Hypatius commands that the deeds of the saints be read from the holy writings. . . . He allows pictorial helps to be used by the simple, as a concession to weakness." Evidently, the Iconophile doctrine is very different from the elitist view of Hypatius.

⁴⁵See Fatouros, I, 452*, n. 884.

⁴⁶Concerning the problem of what this βιβλίον was, one possible option is that βιβλίον was the work of Hypatius alone. We should not forget that in P the lemma reads as follows: Ὑπατίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Ἐφέσου· ἐκ τῶν περὶ Ἰουλιανὸν ἐπ' Ἀτραμντίου συμμικτῶν ζητημάτων, βιβλίου α' κεφαλαίου ε'. See B. Atsalos, *La terminologie du livre-manuscrit à l'époque byzantine*, ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΑ, ΠΑΡΑΡΤΗΜΑ 21 (Thessalonike, 1971), 74–75. Another meaning of the word is also that of λόγος, treatise or suchlike, that gives the same result concerning the format in which Theodore received the text, see ibid., 60.

not, so he sent the βιβλίον⁴⁶ to Theodore of Studios asking for his opinion about the fragment. It seems that Theodore's opinion was finally taken into account and the Iconophile florilegium of cod. *Vaticanus graecus* 511 was completed some time after 821 and the death of Nicetas of Medicion (824) or the death of Theodore of Studios (826), at the latest. However, from the comparison of the five letters of Theodore of Studios to Nicetas of Medicion with the one to Nicetas *monazon* it is difficult to identify the latter with the former for the reasons stated above. Here three options suggest themselves:

(a) Nicetas of Medicion and Nicetas *monazon* are two different persons, who happened to get hold of two different copies of the original of PVM at roughly the same time. Though not impossible, this option may be rejected because the coincidences—name, timing,⁴⁷ and manuscript sources—are too many in the present case.

(b) The attribution of the florilegium of codex *Vaticanus graecus* 511 to Nicetas of Medicion is a scribal error, which should be emended to Νικήτα μονάζοντος. A very poor option, however, since the inscription, of the florilegium (above, p. 181) is so clear that it leaves little space for doubts, and, in any case, the words τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ὁμολογητοῦ secure the name.

(c) The relationship between Theodore and Nicetas must have deteriorated after 821.⁴⁸ To this, one can object that the *Vita Nicetae Mediciensis* itself has been preserved in a manuscript from the monastery of Studios produced in 916 (*Vaticanus gr.* 1660), and possibly represents “eine studitische Bearbeitung des Originaltextes.”⁴⁹ Moreover, in the *VNM* it is stated that at Nicetas' funeral Joseph, the brother of Theodore, was present (§ 48). Still, one cannot but notice the following facts:

The *VNM* is almost silent about the crucial period between early 821 and 3 April 824. Out of all the 49 paragraphs of the vita, ten lines of par. 47 are dedicated to this period. If we consider this vita as a “studitische Bearbeitung,” this silence becomes more understandable. But even if we have the original text, something obviously unfavorable about the saint has been suppressed.

In his fifth letter to Nicetas (452)—the only one that possibly dates after 821 according to Fatouros, but should probably be placed after October of 823⁵⁰—Theodore does not seem to be very happy with the fact that, while at a meeting with other Iconophile clerics and monks at Cape Acritas, he heard Nicetas praising the abbot of the mon-

⁴⁷Since Nicetas was in prison or in exile between 816 and early 821, the most convenient period for the compilation of his florilegium is after the first months of 821.

⁴⁸The same conclusion was reached by E. von Dobschütz, “Methodios und die Studiten,” *BZ* 18 (1909), 81–82. However, the fact that he places the death of Nicetas ca. 820 alone undermines all of his arguments. Moreover, he considered only four letters (333, 280, 432, and 538) of which only 280 had actually been addressed to Nicetas. Number 538 (written between 821 and 826) refers to an abbot of Medicion, but it is not sure that he is our Nicetas (Fatouros, II, 811).

⁴⁹Von Dobschütz, “Methodios,” 83.

⁵⁰In the rather reliable *Vita Theodori Studitae* by Michael the Monk (*BHG* 1754), we are informed that after the defeat and execution of Thomas the Slav (October 823), Theodore of Studios settled somewhere in the vicinity of Cape Acritas (PG 99, col. 320A). The meeting at Cape Acritas that is mentioned in this letter belongs, in all probability, to this period.

astery τῶν Μαξιμίνου for his Iconophile stance. Later on, however, Theodore was told that the abbot of τῶν Μαξιμίνου did not exactly resist holding communion with the Iconoclasts, therefore the praises of Nicetas were simply lies. Furthermore, Theodore concludes the same letter by letting Nicetas know that he does not like any contact with the aforementioned abbot, as long as he remains an Iconoclast (but, at the same time, friend of Nicetas) and does not repent. The whole letter sounds like an indirect warning to Nicetas to stay away from the abbot of Μαξιμίνου. Possibly, Nicetas did not act according to Theodore's wishes.

And last, but not least, the reason for the estrangement between Theodore and Nicetas might be found in the postexile conduct of Nicetas himself: in the period after 821, Nicetas, following the practice of other persecuted monks who returned from exile, bought a *metochion* close to Constantinople, where he spent the last days of his life (*VNM* § 47). Theodore has openly expressed his opinion about that in letter 450 (Τοῖς ἐν ἁστει ἀδελφοῖς, dated 821–826) addressed to his disciples, but obviously applying to all the people in his “party.”⁵¹ Here I may cite some lines of the letter:

(1.7) φοβοῦμαι γὰρ καὶ δεδιῶ μήπως ὑμεῖς οἱ ἐν ἁστει διατρίβοντες εὐριπιστότερον εἰς ἐμπωσὶν τινα ἐμπέσοιτε . . . (1.11) ἀκούω ἀποστασίαν, μεταβασίαν . . . καὶ (p. 637, 1.19) γοῦν ἐτέρους ἀγροὺς ἀγοράζειν, ὃ τῆς ἀθλίας μου ψυχῆς· πῶς ἐν τούτοις οὐ στενάζω . . . (1.25) οὐαὶ τῷ γυναιάζοντι, οὐαὶ τῷ δουλοδούλῳ, οὐαὶ τῷ Γιεζῆ, ὃς ὠνησάμενος ἀγροὺς καὶ ἀμπελώνας κεκληρονόμηκε τὴν λέπραν Νεεμάν, . . . (ed. Fatouros, 636)

Theodore reprimands the disciples who change places (μεταβασίαν) or buy land. Moreover, he places them in the same category with those who buy slaves or womanize (οὐαὶ τῷ γυναιάζοντι). A few lines further on, Theodore excludes from holy communion any of his disciples who would not conform to his orders within a reasonable period of time (1.48–49). It is obvious that Nicetas's movements were not in harmony with the Studite ideal.

Finally, Nicetas by that time was actually a *monazon* wandering from place to place (another practice chastised by Theodore in letter 450) until he settled in the *metochion* he bought. If the two men were on bad terms, it would be reasonable for Theodore to address Nicetas by his title-in-fact, and not in the way he used to address him before. In any case, Nicetas was not the only person that fell from Theodore's grace.

Taking all these factors into account, I may suggest that the identification of Nicetas of Medicion with Nicetas *monazon* is possible. Accordingly, this identification would help to date letter 499 of Theodore of Studios between 821 or more precisely November of 823 (see p. 196, note 50) and 3 April 824 (and not 826). It would also consolidate the hypothesis that the compilation of the florilegium of Nicetas of Medicion took place in the same period. Along the same line I would risk the suggestion that had it not been for Theodore's timely warning, we might have had today a third source for the fragment of Hypatius of Ephesus, namely codex *Vaticanus graecus* 511.

Dumbarton Oaks

⁵¹Fatouros, II, 636–37.